



GOVERNMENT OFFICE
FOR THE SOUTH WEST

***Avon and Somerset Prolific and
other Priority Offenders' Scheme
(PPO)
2003 to 2005***

***Pilot Evaluation Study
September 2006***

Brian Bingham
Researcher & Analyst

Caroline Tanner
Police Analyst



| Contents | page |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Contents | 2 |
| Acronyms | 3 |
| Executive Summary | 5 |
| Acknowledgements | 8 |
| Aims and Objectives | 9 |
| • Introduction | 9 |
| • Aims | 10 |
| • Objectives | 10 |
| Methodology | 12 |
| Findings | 14 |
| Analysis | 17 |
| Bristol analysis | 17 |
| • Entering in 2003 | 17 |
| • Entering in 2004 | 18 |
| • Entering in 2005 | 18 |
| South Gloucestershire analysis | 20 |
| • Entering in 2003 | 20 |
| • Entering in 2004 | 20 |
| • Entering in 2005 | 21 |
| Analysis Summary | 23 |
| Discussion and Recommendations | 24 |
| Conclusions | 28 |
| Appendices | 30 |
| • Appendix A | 31 |
| • Appendix B | 32 |
| • Appendix C | 33 |
| • Appendix D | 34 |
| • Appendix E | 35 |
| • Appendix F | 36 |

Acronyms

| | |
|------------------|---|
| ACAD | Alcohol, Counselling and Drugs service |
| ACR | Automatic Conditional Release (prison automatic release) |
| ASRO | Addressing Substance Related Offending (Probation programme completed in the community) |
| BCU | (Police) Basic Command Unit |
| BDP | Bristol Drugs Project |
| BSDS | Bristol Specialist Drugs Service |
| C-FAR | Residential programme teaching life skills to young people |
| CARATS | Counselling, Assessment, Referral, Advice and Throughcare Services (prison drugs workers) |
| CDRP | Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership |
| Chrysalis | Dry house |
| CRO | Criminal Records Office |
| DAT | Drug Action Team |
| DAAT | Drug and Alcohol Team |
| DIP | Drug Interventions Programme |
| DRR | Drug Rehabilitation Requirement |
| DTTO | Drug Treatment and Testing Order |
| ETE | Education, Training and Employment |
| ETS | Enhanced Thinking Skills (prison 20 session programme) |
| FOCUS | Prison physical education programme |
| HAWKS | Drug agency |
| KWAD | Drug agency (Knowle West Against Drugs) |
| NA | Narcotics Anonymous |
| Nilaari | Drug agency with crack cocaine programme |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| NOMS | National Offender Management Service |
| NOVAS | Housing related support |
| PNC | Police National Computer |
| PPO | Prolific and other Priority Offender |
| P-ASRO | Prison - Addressing Substance Related Offending (prison programme) |
| STAR | Prison based rehabilitation, based on 12 steps programme |

Executive Summary

Previous research undertaken has indicated that a relatively small number of offenders (known as prolific, or priority offenders) have been responsible for a disproportionately large amount of crime and that of this group, over 85% are also likely to be drug misusers.

The Avon and Somerset Prolific and other Priority Offenders' Scheme (PPO) has targeted specific resources, totalling approximately £526K across Bristol and South Gloucestershire to work intensively with those who are considered to be classed as prolific, or persistent, offenders. The primary aim of this research programme was to evaluate the success and/or failure of the PPO scheme as operating throughout Bristol and South Gloucestershire Unitary Authorities in changing offending patterns.

This study has been commissioned to provide the Avon and Somerset PPO Steering Group with a short time limited but totally reliable analysis of the outcomes the Bristol and South Gloucestershire PPO schemes. In reviewing the effectiveness of the schemes, I have included all costs, including hidden costs to organisations and the community.

The study focused on 96 offenders who entered this programme between 1st April 2003 and 31st March 2005. It has shown that:

- **in Bristol and South Gloucestershire costs of operating the PPO scheme is £525,700 – total cost over 3 years 2003/4/5**
- **there was a reduction of 1,712 offences and thus victims of crime**
- **there was an overall saving for both areas of £4,991,000 based on costs of crime**
- **there was an average saving per offender of £51,990 (96 offenders)**

The research programme focussed on a sample of 60 PPO clients chosen at random from Bristol's 115 PPO clients and all 36 PPO clients from South

Gloucestershire between 2003 and 2005. This study has shown that there has been a **saving of approximately £5 Million** on these clients alone, with an average **saving of approximately £52,000 per offender**. These costings take in to account the cost of offences at £2,800 per offence, prison sentences at £20,000 per year (calculated at offenders serving 50% of their imposed sentence) and the additional PPO contribution overall at £525,700. Moreover, there were **1,712 less offences and thus less victims of crime** in the two year period after entering the scheme, when compared with the two year period prior to the scheme overall.

Over the two Unitary Authorities, the most significant changes in offences and drug use initially reported, **overall** were:

- **Dwelling burglaries reduced from 601 to 43 (93%)**
- **Non-dwelling burglaries reduced from 257 to 16 (94%)**
- **Taking of a motor vehicle reduced from 211 to 6 (97%)**
- **Taking from a motor vehicle reduced from 268 to 49 (82%)**

- **Shed and garage burglaries increased from 0 to 7**
- **Commercial burglaries increased from 0 to 9**

It must be noted that 31 of the offenders overall were in prison for all, or part, of their time on the Bristol programme i.e. 52%, whereas 19 of the offenders overall were in prison for all of, or part of, their time on the South Gloucestershire programme i.e. 53%. Yet, both programmes have shown decreases in offending.

Reported usage of drugs prior to entering the scheme of:

- heroin at 45%
- heroin and cocaine at 40%
- cocaine at 29%
- crack at 11%

This study clearly indicates that the PPO scheme has been successful. It is clear that imprisonment works effectively, in the short term as offenders cannot commit further crimes whilst imprisoned. The PPO scheme offers cost effective support throughout their imprisonment and upon release in to the community, resulting in a significant **sustained** reduction in re-offending. The study **strongly indicates** that the PPO scheme is **worthy** of a more detailed, in-depth and wider study as described in the section on 'Discussion and Recommendations' section.

Acknowledgements

All studies and evaluations involve many people and this pilot study is no exception. It therefore owes much to those who contributed on a wide range of topics and provided the raw data for evaluation.

Thanks must go to Avon and Somerset Probation, Avon and Somerset Constabulary, Safer Bristol and Safer South Gloucestershire along with the 2 Bridges Drug and Alcohol Trust. The latter two kindly provided the time and resources to produce this report. The report was financed and overseen by the Government Office for the South West (GOSW). Tim Read has been the Home Office Consultant. The research was produced for the Avon and Somerset Prolific and other Priority Offender Task Group.

The author gratefully acknowledges permission to use material from an earlier exploratory study titled 'An exploratory study of the existing interface between Prolific and Priority Offender Schemes (PPOS) and the Drug Interventions programme (DIP) in the Avon and Somerset Probation Area' undertaken by John Wiseman, Assistant Chief Officer of the Avon and Somerset Probation Area.

Finally, special thanks must go to Caroline Tanner, Police Analyst for the Avon and Somerset Constabulary who painstakingly accessed the data from the Police National Computer (PNC) for those selected prolific and priority offenders.

Aims and Objectives

Introduction

Previous research has evidenced that a relatively small number of offenders (known as prolific, or priority offenders) have been responsible for a disproportionately large amount of crime and that of this group, over 85% are also likely to be drug misusers. The hypothesis is that part of the reason(s) they are committing a high volume of property crime, is to support their drug dependency.

In essence, the Prolific and other Priority Offenders' Scheme (PPO) is a working partnership between the Services of the Police, Probation, Drug Interventions Programme (DIP), Drug and Alcohol Treatment Services, Law Courts, Prison - now under the National Offenders Management Service (NOMS) - and identified offenders.

The scheme's purpose has been to specifically target, monitor and support through throughcare - treatment, rehabilitation and support services - those offenders selected from a sample of the known prolific and priority offenders, with a view to reducing their offending patterns. By doing so, it should therefore reduce the volume of crime and thus victims of crime in the local community.

The Chairs of local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP) are responsible for the delivery of the PPO scheme in their respective area, which in this pilot evaluation study, covers the two Unitary Areas of Bristol and South Gloucestershire.

This study does **not** investigate or comment on other factors which may well have some influence on their offending behaviour - accommodation, employment, education, family, culture, personal and relationship considerations.

The PPO scheme has targeted specific resources to work intensively with those who are considered to be classed as prolific, or persistent, offenders.

Bristol is a Unitary Authority which has a single Drug Action Team (DAT) and a single CDRP which are merged as Safer Bristol. From early 2005, it has a single police Basic Command Unit (BCU) from which it had previously operated three BCUs covering North, Central and South Bristol.

Bristol is a large conurbation with areas of deprivation. It has a number of distinct Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) communities and has been estimated to have approximately 8,000 problematic drug misusers.

South Gloucestershire is a Unitary Authority with co-terminus BCU. Safer South Gloucestershire is a merged CDRP, Drug and Alcohol Team (DAAT). It covers 49,700 hectares, located between Bristol in the South and Gloucestershire in the North, with a population of 250,000. The area is diverse, 75% is rural of which suburban housing and industrial areas dominate the South and more rural locations being in the North. It has been estimated to have approximately 1,200 problematic drug misusers.

Aims

These have been to:

- A.** evaluate the success and/or failure of the Prolific and other Priority Offenders' Scheme (PPO) as operating throughout Bristol and South Gloucestershire in changing offending patterns
- B.** identify the most effective type of Treatment Programme in changing behaviour
- C.** identify the type of offender most likely to change
- D.** evaluate the cost effectiveness of the scheme

Objectives

The data was provided by the respective Bristol and South Gloucestershire PPO Teams to the Police Analyst. A researcher was then asked to provide a detailed analysis report of the supplied data in line with the above Aims. It should be

noted that the information provided by the Bristol PPO and South Gloucestershire PPO teams were, in some areas, presented with a different focus which, within the timescale set for this report being produced, has meant that Aim B has not been fully adhered.

The Objectives include:

- A.** the type and frequency of offences committed two years **prior** to and two years **after** 'entering' the scheme
- B.** a breakdown of the number of offenders who are in prison as part of the scheme
- C.** the number of offenders who are on drug treatment programmes
- D.** an evaluation of the cost effectiveness of the scheme

Methodology

Both the Bristol and South Gloucestershire PPO teams provided a sample of offenders which they considered to be prolific, or persistent, offenders of property crime. There is an annual target number of offenders being placed on the scheme - this is approximately 115 from Bristol and approximately 30 from South Gloucestershire.

A stratified random sample of 60 offenders from Bristol and all offenders totalling 36, on the South Gloucestershire scheme between 1st April 2003 and 31st March 2005, had their offending records checked by a Police Analyst accessing the PNC to cover a period 2 years prior to them entering the scheme and a period of 2 years after having entered the scheme. The following details were obtained on those offenders:

- Name
- Date of birth
- CRO number
- Gender
- Ethnic origin
- Home status i.e. homeless, rented accommodation, parents etc
- Marital status
- Type of Treatment Programme(s)
- Type of offence(s)

The above **information was sanitised for reasons of total confidentiality** by way of their name, date of birth and CRO number being converted to a unique identification number, known only to the Police Analyst. This sanitised data was then passed to a researcher, the author, for a breakdown analysis and whose remit was to produce a report to include:

- the type of offences being committed prior to and after entering the scheme

- the frequency of those offences
- a breakdown of those offenders
- the number of offenders who are in prison as part of the scheme
- the number of offenders who have been on Treatment Programmes

The sanitised data was collated and analysed separately, i.e. Bristol and South Gloucestershire and kept that way throughout the analysis until the final summary where both results were drawn together.

Unfortunately both PPO teams had not supplied the same data structure, which made it difficult to form a comparison, for example Bristol had not provided any ethnicity data.

It was proposed that 'criminality' be assessed, using a standard criminality score for each offence. However, the Research Steering Group rejected the available criminality score chart as unreliable.

The analysis then became a tabulation exercise in collating and classifying all of the data into lists and quantities of offences mentioned as before and after entering the scheme. The most difficult analysis was to establish where the offences should be listed and thus counted if committed during the year they entered the scheme. It should, in theory, be as simple as subtracting the number of offences after entering the scheme from the number of offences before entering the scheme and similarly for prison sentences etc. This is discussed more in the 'Conclusion and Recommendations' section.

Findings

The offender data samples indicating age groups, gender and ethnicity were provided as summarised in **Table A** below:

Table A

| | Bristol (n) | | | South Gloucestershire (n) | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| Age groups | | | | | | |
| 20 - 25 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 26 - 30 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 31 - 35 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 36 - 40 | 4 | 2 | 1 | | 5 | 2 |
| 41 - 45 | | 2 | 1 | | 2 | |
| 46 - 50 | | | | | 2 | |
| Male / Female | 16M 2F | 19M 1F | 19M 1F | 9M | 19M | 6M 2F |
| Total | 60 (56M 4F) | | | 36 (34M 2F) | | |
| Ethnicity | No data supplied | | | White British | | |
| | | | | 78% | 93% | 100% |
| | | | | Black British | | |
| | | | | 12% | 7% | 0% |

The additional funding provided to the respective PPO schemes are shown in **Table B** below:

Table B

| | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| Bristol - overall | £112,000 | £115,000 | £118,000 |
| Bristol - per offender (60) | £1,867 | £1,917 | £1,967 |
| South Gloucestershire - overall | £58,500 | £60,200 | £62,000 |
| South Gloucestershire - per offender (36) | £1,625 | £1,672 | £1,722 |

Details of the offence types and quantities in the 2 year period prior to entering the scheme and in the 2 year period after entering the scheme, are shown below:

As an example,

Appendix A ~ Bristol 2003 depicts those who entered the scheme in 2003

Appendix A - Bristol 2003

Appendix B - Bristol 2004

Appendix C - Bristol 2005

Appendix D - South Gloucestershire 2003

Appendix E - South Gloucestershire 2004

Appendix F - South Gloucestershire 2005

In investigating the costs of prison sentences, it was established from the Report of the Social Exclusion Units (SEU) in July 2002, the average cost of a prison sentence is calculated at approximately £37,500. However advice has been sought from the Probation Service who suggested that the offenders on the PPO scheme would be more likely to be imprisoned to either a semi-secure prison i.e. Category C Training establishment, or at the worst a Category B (more secure) Training establishment and the approximate cost would be £20,000 per annum, per offender.

It was further advised that most offenders would qualify for Automatic Conditional Release (ACR), which would usually be at the half-way stage of their sentence. This has been taken in to account in this study and all prison sentence costings have been calculated at half of the imposed sentence. For example, an offender being sentenced by the Courts to 3 years, has been calculated/costed as him/her serving 1.5 years.

A Home Office model indicates that the cost to the community per offence is approximately £2,800 and this is the figure that has been used throughout this study in calculating the cost per offence, prior, during and after entering the scheme.

Of the data provided, there was relatively little by way of numbers being placed on Drug Treatment and Testing Orders (DTTO) or Drug Rehabilitation Requirements (DRR). Yet the Prolific and Priority team has evidenced that there have been more of the PPOs on DTTO/DRRs than were recorded. Only one offender from Bristol 2003 was shown to be placed on a DRR and on the 2005 scheme, only one offender had breached their DTTO and was sentenced to imprisonment.

Similarly, one offender from South Gloucestershire in 2003 had breached their DTTO and was sentenced to imprisonment. From South Gloucestershire in 2004, one offender was on a DTTO and two others breached their DTTO and were sentenced to imprisonment.

Whilst much data was provided on the Treatment Programmes, this was not particularly useful. For example, several offenders had undertaken four, five or six programmes throughout their time, but without any useful feedback it has not been possible to assess which were, or were not, useful to them. Much the same may be said about their accommodation – lists of statistics are of little use without qualification.

Analysis

2003, 2004 and 2005 ~ Bristol analysis

Of those entering from Bristol in 2003, there were 20 offenders comprising of 18 male and 2 female. A total of 450 offences were committed in the period of 2 years before entering the scheme, this reduced to 91 in the two year period after entering the scheme. This equates to a reduction of 359 offences (78%) and thus less victims of crime saving £1,005,200 in the process. Of those serving prison sentences, this had reduced from 27.2 years to 7.1 years, equating to a reduction of 20.1 years (74%) and prison saving £403,500. The contributions to the PPO scheme were approximately £112,000. Overall, there was a cost saving of £1,296,700 which equates to £64,835 per offender.

Offence details:

- Dwelling burglaries reduced from 242 to 15 (94%)
- Non-dwelling burglaries reduced from 49 to 0 (100%)

- Taking from a motor vehicle increased from 18 to 35 (95%)
- Shed and garage burglaries increased from 0 to 7

For a full breakdown of offences, please see **Appendix A**

Their indicated drug use prior to entering the scheme included: 9 not recorded; 4 heroin; 4 heroin and cocaine; 1 heroin, cocaine and amphetamines; 1 cocaine; 1 cannabis and benzos

The Treatment Programmes received were recorded as: 5 rehab; 3 Progress 2 Work; 3 KWADS; 2 education; 1 Drug Therapeutic Community; 2 ETS; 9 CARATS; 1 detox programme; 3 STAR programme; 3 P-ASRO; 1 Nilaari; 1 counselling; 1 ACAD; 1 Turning Point and 1 Southmead Project

Of those entering from Bristol in 2004, there were 20 offenders comprising of 19 male and 1 female. A total of 439 offences were committed in the period of 2 years before entering the scheme, this reduced to 69 in the two year period after entering the scheme. This equates to a reduction of 370 offences (84%) and thus less victims of crime saving £1,036,000 in the process. Of those serving prison sentences, this had **increased** slightly from 11.7 years to 12 years, equating to an increase of 0.3 years (3.4%) and prison increased costing of £7,900. The contributions to the PPO scheme were approximately £115,000. However, there was an overall cost saving of £913,100 which equates to £45,655 per offender.

Offence details:

- Dwelling burglaries reduced from 137 to 20 (85%)
- Non-dwelling burglaries reduced from 64 to 4 (94%)
- Commercial burglaries increased from 0 to 9

For a full breakdown of offences, please see **Appendix B**

Their indicated drug use prior to entering the scheme included: 8 heroin and cocaine; 3 heroin; 1 heroin and cannabis; 1 heroin, cannabis, cocaine; 1 cocaine; 1 not recorded; 1 heroin, cocaine, benzos and amphetamines; 1 heroin, cocaine, amphetamine; 1 heroin and crack; 1 cocaine and cannabis.

The Treatment Programmes received were recorded as: 10 CARATS; 7 rehab 5 HUB; 4 BSDS; 3 Southmead Project; 2 KWADS; 2 counselling; 2 NA; 2 BDP; 2 Change programme; 1 education; 1 ETS; 1 P-ASRO; 1 FOCUS; 1 Penthouse programme; 1 Involve; 1 C-FAR; 1 Cedar House; 1 Fairbridge Trust; 1 ETE; 1 Lawrence Western Project; 1 Releasing Potential Workforce and 1 Chrysalis.

Of those entering from Bristol in 2005, there were 20 offenders comprising of 19 male and 1 female. A total of 426 offences were committed in the period of 2 years before entering the scheme, this reduced to 1 in the one year period after

entering the scheme. This equates to a reduction of 425 offences (99%) and thus less victims of crime saving £1,190,000 in the process. Of those serving prison sentences, this had reduced from 18.2 years to 6.5 years, equating to a reduction of 11.7 years (61%) and prison saving of £206,500. The contributions to the PPO scheme were approximately £118,000. There was an overall cost saving of £1,278,500 which equates to £63,925 per offender. It must be remembered that this is the group where details were only recorded up to 31st March 2006 and thus further crimes may have been committed which have not been taken in to consideration. This group were also mostly serving prison sentences in the period after entering the scheme and thus not able to commit further crimes.

Offence details:

- Non-dwelling burglaries reduced from 85 to 0 (100%)
- Taking of a motor vehicle reduced from 57 to 1 (98%)

For a full breakdown of offences, please see **Appendix C**

Their indicated drug use prior to entering the scheme included: 11 heroin; 11 cocaine; 6 not recorded; 5 benzos; 3 cannabis and 3 amphetamines.

The Treatment Programmes received were recorded as: 8 CARATS; 4 BSDS; 4 BDP; 3 P-ASRO; 3 NA; 3 ETS; 2 HUB; 2 Think first; 2 KWADS; 2 Nilaari; 2 NOVAS; 2 penthouse programme; 2 Change programme; 2 Believe; 2 not recorded; 1 relapse prevention; 1 HAWKS; 1 self-help housing; 1 Releasing Potential Workforce; 1 Anger management; 1 CHMT; 1 PS Plus2; 1 Drug and Alcohol Services; 1 Crossroads and 1 Southmead Project.

Summary of Bristol analysis

- Contribution to Probation PPO scheme of £345,000
- Offence and prison cost saving £3,833,300
- Total saving of £3,488,300
- 1,154 less offences and thus victims of crime

- 60 offenders on the scheme
- An average of £58,138 per offender saved

2003, 2004 and 2005 ~ South Gloucestershire analysis

Of those entering from South Gloucestershire in 2003, there were 9 male offenders. A total of 245 offences were committed in the period of 2 years before entering the scheme, this reduced to 34 in the two year period after entering the scheme. This equates to a reduction of 211 offences (86%) and less thus victims of crime saving £590,000 in the process. Of those serving prison sentences, this had **increased** from 1.8 years to 3.6 years, equating to an increase of 1.8 years (100%) and prison saving £37,500. The contributions to the PPO scheme were approximately £58,500. Overall, there was a cost saving of £494,800 which equates to £54,978 per offender.

Offence details:

- Dwelling burglaries reduced from 64 to 6 (90%)
- Taking from a motor vehicle reduced from 62 to 52 (16%)
- Snatch theft increased from 0 to 1

For a full breakdown of offences, please see **Appendix D**

Their indicated drug use prior to entering the scheme included: 5 heroin; 5 cocaine; 3 not recorded and 1 cannabis.

The Treatment Programmes received were recorded as: 1 Rehab; 4 CARATS; 2 DIP; 1 Evolve and 1 not recorded

Of those entering from South Gloucestershire in 2004, there were 19 male offenders. A total of 262 offences were committed in the period of 2 years before

entering the scheme, this reduced to 18 in the two year period after entering the scheme. This equates to a reduction of 244 offences (93%) and thus less victims of crime saving £683,000 in the process. Of those serving prison sentences, this had reduced from 16.7 years to 9.5 years, equating to a reduction of 7.2 years (43%) and prison saving £143,000. The contributions to the PPO scheme were approximately £60,200. Overall, there was a cost saving of £766,500 which equates to £40,342 per offender.

Offence details:

- Dwelling burglaries reduced from 69 to 1 (95.5%)
- Taking from a motor vehicle reduced from 56 to 1 (98%)
- Going equipped increased from 0 to 1
- Assault increased from 0 to 4

For a full breakdown of offences, please see **Appendix E**

Their indicated drug use prior to entering the scheme included: 13 heroin; 5 not recorded; 2 crack; 2 cocaine and 1 amphetamine.

The Treatment Programmes received were recorded as: 9 not recorded; 5 CARATS; 1 Southmead Project; 1 Rehab; 1 BDP; 1 ARA; 1 penthouse project; 1 DIP; 1 rehab and 1 Nilaari.

Of those entering from South Gloucestershire in 2005, there were 8 offenders comprising of 6 male and 2 female. A total of 107 offences were committed in the period of 2 years before entering the scheme, this reduced to 4 in the one year period after entering the scheme. This equates to a reduction of 103 offences (96%) and thus less victims of crime saving £288,400 in the process. Of those serving prison sentences, this had reduced slightly from 6.3 years to 5.5 years, equating to a reduction of 0.8 years (12%) and prison saving £15,000. The contributions to the PPO scheme were approximately £62,000.

Overall, there was a cost saving of £241,400 which equates to £30,175 per offender.

Offence details:

- Dwelling burglaries reduced from 43 to 1 (97%)
- Non-dwelling burglaries reduced from 11 to 0 (100%)
- Class A drugs increased from 0 to 1

For a full breakdown of offences, please see **Appendix F**

Their indicated drug use prior to entering the scheme included: 6 heroin; 2 cocaine; 1 amphetamine and 1 alcohol.

The Treatment Programmes received were recorded as: 6 CARATS; 1 Penthouse Project; 1 P-ASRO and 2 DIP.

Summary of South Gloucestershire analysis

- Contribution to PPO cost of £180,700
- Total saved £1,502,700
- 558 less offences and thus victims of crime
- 36 offenders on the scheme
- An average of £41,742 per offender saved

Analysis summary

In combining both the total of Bristol and South Gloucestershire results, this produced the following:

- an overall reduction of 1,712 offences and thus victims of crime for Bristol and South Gloucestershire
- an overall contribution to the PPO scheme of £525,700
- an overall saving for both areas of £4,991,000
- an average saving per offender of £51,990 (96 offenders)

Table C below shows the total indicated drug misuse prior to entering the scheme

Table C

| Drug | n |
|----------------------------------|----------|
| Alcohol | 1 |
| Amphetamines | 4 |
| Benzos | 1 |
| Cannabis | 4 |
| Cannabis and Benzos | 1 |
| Cocaine | 20 |
| Cocaine and amphetamines | 1 |
| Cocaine and cannabis | 1 |
| Crack | 2 |
| Heroin | 42 |
| Heroin and cannabis | 1 |
| Heroin and cocaine | 12 |
| Heroin and crack | 1 |
| Heroin, cocaine and amphetamines | 1 |
| Heroin, cocaine and cannabis | 1 |
| None as listed | 25 |

Discussion and Recommendations

Perhaps the most difficult, crucial and pivotal element of this study has been to set guidelines as to where the 'entered the scheme' date actually begins. By this it is meant that of those who, for example, entered the scheme in 2003 where an actual date has been given, it has been difficult to assess when they were in prison and when their crimes were committed. This also has a secondary impact, that of deciding where the crimes committed fall during that year, bearing in mind that no actual crime committed date has been given. In trying to assess this, three separate analyses were undertaken. For example, for those crimes committed during the year they entered, should they be:

1. counted and analysed as being committed during the period prior to entering the scheme?
2. totally discounted?
3. counted and analysed as being committed during the period after entering the scheme?

Whilst options 2 and 3 may seem irrelevant, in fact these came from a lack of clear understanding as to when the crimes were actually committed during that year. Since that could not be clearly established, then common sense and practicality must preside. For example, if an offender enters the scheme on July 12th and they commit a crime on July 29th it is clear that this would be considered as occurring after entering the scheme. For a crime committed on June 5th of that year, it would be considered as occurring prior to entering the scheme. However, this data is not clearly available and so for reasons of continuity, all crimes having been listed as occurring during the year of entry to the scheme have been considered and calculated as occurring **before** entering the scheme. This will, no doubt, offer skewed results, but will be consistent and it is reasonable to assume that many of the pluses and minuses will even themselves out.

Bearing in mind the above, a discussion at this stage would be useful, both in order to understand what has been done and to offer some guidance for any possible future PPO study. Taking that of Aims first...

In looking at **Aim A** '*evaluate the success and/or failure of the Prolific and other Priority Offenders' scheme as operating throughout Bristol and South Gloucestershire*'. It can be clearly seen from the results obtained that the PPO scheme has significantly reduced the amount of crimes being committed in the community. The most significant reductions were seen to be domestic dwellings, burglaries and non-domestic dwellings burglaries.

Aim B '*identify the most effective type of Treatment Programme in changing behaviour*'. This has proven to be problematic since whilst there was much data provided, it was in a quantitative manner rather than qualitative. It would be fairly straightforward to provided statistical data stating how many offenders attended CARATS, Southmead Project, as examples, but this would not be conclusive.

It would have been much more accurate to have had details of which offenders found which Treatment Programmes useful and for what reason(s) and perhaps the dates when these programmes were attended. Quite simply, an offender who has attended perhaps five programmes is a pointless fact without clarification as to what effect each had.

Perhaps for any future study, more detailed information could be provided which could then be analysed with conclusive results.

Aim C to '*identify the type of offender most likely to change*' has been quite productive and one of the most conclusive. In linking with Aim A above, it would perhaps be better to address the Aim from the angle of what the most significant characteristics have been identified as:

- dwelling and non-dwelling burglaries have significantly reduced
- the average age has been 32

- their ethnicity has been White British
- male gender
- significant reported use of heroin and cocaine prior to entering the PPO scheme

Aim D to '*evaluate the cost effectiveness of the scheme*' has been addressed throughout the study, the results of which have been very encouraging. The PPO scheme in Bristol, having 60 offenders, received additional funding of approximately £345,000 which resulted in a reduction of 1,154 offences and one assumes, victims of crime. The cost to the community savings alone were calculated to be £3,833,300 which equates to an average saving per offender of £58,138.

There is a similar result for South Gloucestershire with its 36 offenders. The additional PPO funding was approximately £180,700 which resulted in a reduction of 558 offences and one assumes, victims of crime. The cost to the community savings alone were calculated to be £1,502,700 which equates to an average saving per offender of £41,742.

Overall for both the Bristol and South Gloucestershire PPO schemes which received a total additional financial contribution of £525,700 this has resulted in a saving of £4,991,000. In addition, crimes committed in the community reduced by 1,712.

Worthy of note at this stage is that the offenders who entered the scheme during 2005, entered by 31st March 2005. It has only been possible to consider offending behaviour for one year (2005/2006) after entering the scheme and two years before entering the scheme. This then, does not provide an equivalent data set for offences across the three sample groups. For example, those who entered in 2003, the prior period was 2001 and post period 2005.

Difficulties were also found with trying to analyse what, if any, change in behaviour could be seen from the type of accommodation being used. But again lists of unquantified data are far from definitive and thus not conclusive for the purpose of this study.

Should a further study be undertaken in the future, it would be helpful to know the following:

- the actual dates of the offences
- the date when the offender enters the scheme
- the date when their accommodation situation alters and from what to what, i.e. living with parents, to living in a hostel
- the dates when Treatment Programmes were undertaken and the results, i.e. useful, not useful
- results of a small scale survey of those offenders i.e. 20% for more in-depth information

Conclusion

This study has been commissioned to provide the Avon and Somerset PPO Steering Group with a short timescale but totally reliable analysis of the outcomes the Bristol and South Gloucestershire PPO schemes. In reviewing the effectiveness of the schemes, I have included all costs, including hidden costs to organisations and the community.

The study has shown that:

- **in Bristol and South Gloucestershire costs of operating the PPO scheme is £525,700**
- **there was a reduction of 1,712 offences and thus victims of crime**
- **there was an overall saving for both areas of £4,991,000 based on costs of crime**
- **there was an average saving per offender of £51,990 (96 offenders) occurred**

Reported usage of drugs prior to entering the scheme of:

- heroin at 45%
- heroin and cocaine at 40%
- cocaine at 29%
- crack at 11%

It must be noted that 31 of the offenders overall were in prison for all, or part, of their time on the Bristol programme i.e. 52%, whereas 19 of the offenders overall were in prison for all of, or part of, their time on the South Gloucestershire programme i.e. 53%. Yet, both programmes have shown decreases in offending.

This study clearly indicates that the PPO scheme has been successful. It is clear that imprisonment works effectively, in the short term as offenders cannot commit

further crimes whilst imprisoned. The PPO scheme offers cost effective support throughout their imprisonment and upon release in to the community, resulting in a significant **sustained** reduction in re-offending. The study **strongly indicates** that the PPO scheme is **worthy** of a more detailed, in-depth and wider study as described in the section on 'Discussion and Recommendations'.

]

Brian Bingham

Tel: 01454 ~ 868 552
Mobile: 07914 ~ 275 349
Fax: 01454 ~ 868 767
Email: brian.bingham@southglos.gov.uk

Caroline Tanner

Tel: 01179 ~ 454 163
Email: caroline.tanner@avonandsomerset.police.uk

September 2006

Appendices

Appendix A

Bristol 2003 – list of offences

| Offences (n) | Before (2001) | After (2005) | Difference |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| ABH | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Assault | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Criminal damage | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Deception | 2 | 0 | -2 |
| Dwelling burglary | 242 | 15 | -227 |
| Fraud | 49 | 7 | -42 |
| Forgery | 5 | 0 | -5 |
| GBH | 2 | 0 | -2 |
| Going equipped | 3 | 0 | -3 |
| Handling stolen goods | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Non-dwelling burglary | 49 | 0 | -49 |
| Possession of drugs | 2 | 1 | -1 |
| Receiving stolen goods | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Robbery | 8 | 0 | -8 |
| Shoplifting | 37 | 14 | -23 |
| Shed and garage burglary | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| Taking from a motor vehicle | 18 | 35 | 17 |
| Taking of a motor vehicle | 12 | 1 | -11 |
| Theft | 16 | 0 | -16 |
| Totals = | 450 | 91 | -359 |
| Averages = | 22.5 | 4.55 | -17.95 |

Appendix B

Bristol 2004 – list of offences

| Offences (n) | Before (2002) | After (2006) | Difference |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Assault | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Commercial burglary | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| Criminal damage | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Drug offences | 2 | 0 | -2 |
| Dwelling burglary | 137 | 20 | -117 |
| Fraud | 49 | 7 | -42 |
| Fraud/theft | 68 | 0 | -68 |
| GBH | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Harassment | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Making off without payment | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Non-dwelling burglary | 64 | 4 | -60 |
| Robbery | 3 | 0 | -3 |
| Shoplifting | 28 | 15 | -13 |
| Taking from a motor vehicle | 8 | 1 | -7 |
| Taking of a motor vehicle | 54 | 2 | -52 |
| Theft | 14 | 3 | -11 |
| Violence | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Totals = | 439 | 69 | -370 |
| Averages = | 21.95 | 3.45 | -18.50 |

Appendix C

Bristol 2005 – list of offences

| Offences (n) | Before (2003) | After (2006) | Difference |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Assault | 20 | 0 | -20 |
| Bilking | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Criminal damage | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Dwelling burglary | 46 | 0 | -46 |
| Fraud | 38 | 0 | -38 |
| Non-dwelling burglary | 85 | 0 | -85 |
| Robbery | 2 | 0 | -2 |
| Shoplifting | 22 | 0 | -22 |
| Taking from a motor vehicle | 121 | 0 | -121 |
| Taking of a motor vehicle | 57 | 1 | -56 |
| Theft | 32 | 0 | -32 |
| Violence | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Totals = | 426 | 1 | -425 |
| Averages = | 21.30 | 0.05 | -21.25 |

Appendix D

South Gloucestershire 2003

| Offences (n) | Before (2001) | After (2005) | Difference |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| ABH | 2 | 0 | -2 |
| Assault | 3 | 0 | -3 |
| Bilking | 6 | 1 | -5 |
| Dwelling burglary | 64 | 6 | -58 |
| Handling stolen goods | 2 | 0 | -2 |
| Miscellaneous | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Non-dwelling burglary | 22 | 5 | -17 |
| Possession of drugs | 3 | 1 | -2 |
| Robbery | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Shed/garage burglary | 22 | 0 | -22 |
| Shoplifting | 11 | 2 | -9 |
| Snath theft | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Taking from a motor vehicle | 62 | 10 | -52 |
| Taking of a motor vehicle | 32 | 2 | -30 |
| Theft | 13 | 6 | -7 |
| Violence | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Totals = | 245 | 34 | -211 |
| Averages = | 12.25 | 1.7 | -10.55 |

Appendix E

South Gloucestershire 2004

| Offences (n) | Before (2002) | After (2006) | Difference |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Arson | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Assault | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Bilking | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Class A drugs | 2 | 1 | -1 |
| Criminal damage | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Dwelling burglary | 69 | 1 | -68 |
| Fraud | 29 | 0 | -29 |
| Going equipped | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Non-dwelling burglary | 26 | 7 | -19 |
| Other | 2 | 0 | -2 |
| Receiving stolen goods | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Robbery | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Shed/garage burglary | 5 | 0 | -5 |
| Shoplifting | 4 | 0 | -4 |
| Taking from a motor vehicle | 56 | 1 | -55 |
| Taking of a motor vehicle | 47 | 0 | -47 |
| Theft | 17 | 0 | -17 |
| Totals = | 262 | 18 | -244 |
| Averages = | 13.79 | 0.95 | -12.84 |

Appendix F

South Gloucestershire 2005

| Offences (n) | Before (2003) | After (2006) | Difference |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| ABH | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Assault | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Bilking | 7 | 0 | -7 |
| Class A drug | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Deception | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Drugs | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Dwelling burglary | 43 | 1 | -42 |
| Going equipped | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Handling stolen goods | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Non-dwelling burglary | 11 | 0 | -11 |
| Receiving stolen goods | 2 | 0 | -2 |
| Robbery | 4 | 0 | -4 |
| Shoplifting | 11 | 0 | -11 |
| Taking from a motor vehicle | 3 | 2 | -1 |
| Taking of a motor vehicle | 9 | 0 | -9 |
| Theft | 11 | 0 | -11 |
| Totals = | 107 | 4 | -103 |
| Averages = | 5.35 | 0.2 | -5.15 |